

DIP CR Final Assessment Report

CR0003 'DIP On-Boarding and requirements clarifications'

Contents

| | | |
|----|----------------------|----|
| 1. | Summary | 2 |
| 2. | Background and Issue | 3 |
| 3. | Solution | 5 |
| 4. | Impacts and Costs | 8 |
| 5. | DIP CR Progression | 10 |
| 6. | Industry Views | 11 |
| 7. | Recommendations | 19 |



Contact

Sean Dryden-Woods

020 7380 4086

Sean.woods@elexon.co.uk

DIPManager@elexon.co.uk



About This Document

You can find the definitions of the terms and acronyms used in this document in the [DIP Glossary](#)¹.

This document is a Data Integration Platform (DIP) Change Request (CR) Final Assessment Report for DCR0003.

There are three parts to this document:

- This is the main document. It provides a summary of the solution, impacts, anticipated costs, and proposed implementation approach. It also summarises the Workgroup views and the views of respondents to the DIP CR Consultation.
- Attachment A contains the full responses received to the DIP CR Consultation.
- Attachment B-G contains the proposed redlined changes to deliver the DIP CR solution.

¹ <https://bscdocs.elexon.co.uk/data-integration-platform/dsd007-dip-glossary>

1. Summary



Not sure where to start?

We suggest reading the following sections:

- Have 5 minutes? Read section 1
- Have 15 minutes? Read sections 1, and 5
- Have 30 minutes? Read all sections
- Have longer? Read all sections and the annexes and attachments

Background and Issue

DIP Users must undergo DIP On-Boarding checks before they can access the DIP. These checks are conducted by the DIP Manager, who adheres to the DIP Rules. The [DIP Assessment Criteria](#)² have been approved and published via MHHS Programme routes, however, the DIP On-Boarding requirements are not clearly outlined in the DIP Rules. This creates a risk of prospective DIP Users being unprepared for or confused by DIP On-Boarding, which could impact Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Qualification.

Solution

This DIP CR proposes to detail the DIP On-Boarding Assessment Criteria within the DIP Rules, to ensure that the requirements are clear for DIP Users. This will involve amendments to the DIP Rules to ensure clear alignment with the agreed MHHS design.

Impacts and costs

There are no new requirements being placed on DIP Users, and therefore no DIP User system impacts. There will be a positive impact on potential DIP Users, as this DIP CR will provide extra clarity for those going through DIP On-Boarding.

Cost Estimates

| Organisation | Implementation (£) | On-going (£) | Impacts |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| DIP Manager | <3k | N/A | Updating six DIP documents |
| Industry | N/A | N/A | No new requirements for DIP Users |
| Total | <3k | 0 | |

DIP CR Progression

This DIP CR is being progressed as a Tier Two DIP CR, as there are no material impacts.

DIP Manager initially recommends an Implementation Date of **5 August 2025**. This will allow the benefits to be realised as soon as possible and mitigate the risk of confusion for those undertaking MHHS Qualification.

DIP CR Final Assessment Report

7 July 2025

Version 1.0

Page 2 of 19

© Elexon 2025

²

<https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/api/documentlibrary/Qualification/DIP%20Assessment%20Criteria%20for%20MHHS%20Qualification.pdf>

2. Background and Issue

What is the issue?

As the DIP Manager, Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement (MHHS) Programme and other stakeholders have collaborated it has become clear that the DIP Rules require some clarification to ensure that they are helpful and clear for prospective DIP Users regarding DIP On-Boarding.

The DIP Rules were drafted with the enduring arrangements in mind. However, as we have worked with colleagues across the MHHS Programme it has become apparent that further detail is required to facilitate MHHS Qualification (See [BSC Section C](#)³).

Similarly, as the MHHS Programme has evolved, and we have worked further with the Code Bodies, how we carry out different DIP On-Boarding checks has evolved. We think prospective DIP Users would benefit from greater clarity in the DIP Rules on how the DIP Manager intends to check that DIP Users are ready to use the DIP.

Additionally, following review of the requirements detailed in the DIP Rules in [DSD002 Annex 2 'Detailed DIP Operational Requirements'](#)⁴, it has been determined that amendments are required to ensure clarity and alignment with the MHHS Programme DIP design. The Non-Functional Requirements (NFRs) in [MHHS-E2E002](#)⁵ and the interface usage requirements and responsibilities from the [Interface Code of Connection](#)⁶ need to be reflected in the DIP Rules.

Not updating the DIP Rules could result in prospective DIP Users potentially being unclear on how their readiness will be assessed and what will be required from them as part of those checks. Additionally, any disparity between the DIP Rules and MHHS design documents could cause confusion for DIP Users.

Background

MHHS requires parties to qualify for the arrangements. Code Bodies, such as the Balancing and Settlement Code (BSC) and Retail Energy Code (REC), are responsible for MHHS Qualification. To qualify for MHHS, parties that have Code obligations that require them to use the DIP must be On-Boarded to the DIP; it is a prerequisite of Qualification. However, the DIP Managers' vires to place obligations on prospective DIP users as part of MHHS Qualification before M10 is not clear in the DIP Rules, though it is via BSC Section C and the MHHS Qualification approach and plan.

The DIP Assessment Criteria, considering both enduring operation and MHHS Qualification, have been considered and agreed through discussion with the MHHS Programme and Code Bodies. The DIP Manager will check prospective DIP Users preparedness as part of DIP On-Boarding through:

- Self-testing – this equates to PIT in the MHHS Programme;
- Self-assessment – this equates to the Qualification Assessment Document (QAD) in the MHHS Programme; and
- Testing in the non-Production Environment – this equates to System Integration Testing (SIT) and Qualification Testing (QT) in the MHHS Programme.

³ <https://bscdocs.elxon.co.uk/bsc/bsc-section-c-bscco-and-its-subsidiaries#section-c-12-12.2>

⁴ <https://bscdocs.elxon.co.uk/data-integration-platform/dsd002-annex-2-detailed-dip-operational-requirements>

⁵ <https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/api/documentlibrary/Design Documents/MHHS-E2E002 Requirements v3.5.xlsx>

⁶ <https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/dip/interface-code-of-connection-and-pki-certificate-policy>

The DIP Rules as drafted during [Issue 101 'Ongoing Governance, Funding and Operation of the Market-wide Half Hourly Settlement \(MHHS\) Data Integration Platform \(DIP\) by BSCCo'](#)⁷ and subsequently [P474 'Ongoing governance, funding and operation of the Data Integration Platform \(DIP\)'](#)⁸ reflected the thinking of the time. Industry stakeholders were consulted and agreed on the drafted DIP Rules at the time. As collaboration with Code Bodies and the MHHS Programme has intensified, the DIP On-Boarding checks and vires have evolved. In turn, the DIP Rules need to be adapted to reflect this.

For clarity, the existing arrangements will not prevent anyone from being able to use the DIP, the changes proposed here are intended to further mitigate the risk of prospective DIP Users being unprepared for or confused by DIP On-Boarding.

Desired outcomes

This DIP CR aims to provide clarity to prospective DIP Users around the DIP On-Boarding process for enduring operation and MHHS Qualification. The intention is to clearly align the DIP Rules with the agreed MHHS design and Qualification processes. This will reduce the risk of issues for potential DIP Users.

⁷ <https://www.elexon.co.uk/bsc/smg-issue/issue-101/>

⁸ <https://www.elexon.co.uk/bsc/mod-proposal/p474/>

3. Solution

Proposed solution

This DIP CR proposes to amend the DIP Rules to:

- Clarify that the DIP Manager has vires to assess readiness ahead of M10;
- Clearly display the DIP On-Boarding criteria;
- Categorise how each criteria can be met and how the DIP Manager will work with Code Bodies to ensure requirements are met;
- Add reference to testing undertaken as part of MHHS Programme and associated MHHS Qualification approaches and plans;
- Rename DSD002 Annex 1 to reflect the fact that it contains all DIP On-Boarding checks, not just non-functional;
- Clarify the requirements in DSD002 Annex 2 to clearly reflect the NFRs and Interface Code of Connection; and
- Define MHHS Qualification.

Proposer's rationale

The proposed solution will provide extra clarity for those going through DIP On-Boarding. It will also ensure consistency between MHHS Qualification and enduring DIP On-Boarding arrangements. This solution will ensure that the DIP On-Boarding process is optimised to support the wider MHHS Qualification requirements.

Proposed redlining

The following table summarises the proposed redlining updates. Any references to E2EXXX numbers relate to the MHHS design NFRs detailed in [MHHS-E2E002](#)⁹. Housekeeping updates have also been made throughout the documents, including fixing numbering issues, formatting corrections and capitalisations.

| Summary of redlining updates | |
|--|---|
| DIP Document | Updates |
| DSD001 'Governance' ¹⁰ (Attachment B) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 – clarification that the DIP Manager has vires to assess DIP On-Boarding readiness in support of MHHS Qualification. |
| DSD001 Annex 1 DIP Rules Implementation Dates and Transition Arrangements' ¹¹ (Attachment C) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.3 and 2.4 – clarification of effective date of DSD002 in relation to MHHS Qualification; 3.3 – update to title of DSD002 Annex 1; 3.3 – clarification that DIP Users can be promoted to the production environment prior to completing Industry Code Qualification during MHHS Qualification. |
| DSD002 'DIP Connection and Operation' ¹² (Attachment D) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 – clarification that DIP On-Boarding will be required for MHHS Qualification; 2.5 – clarification that DIP Users must follow directions from DIP Manager in relation to DIP On-Boarding as part of MHHS Qualification; 2.1 – removal of references to “non-functional” checks, to align with the renaming of DSD002 Annex 1; 2.1 – clarification that collaboration between DIP Manager and Industry Codes in relation to On-Boarding checks applies to MHHS Qualification also; 2.1 – clarification that DIP Connection Providers (DCPs) may carry out checks on behalf of DIP Applicant; 2.1.4 – clarification that the requirement to complete Industry Code Qualification prior to promotion to the production environment does not apply during MHHS Qualification. |

⁹ <https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/api/documentlibrary/Design Documents/MHHS-E2E002 Requirements v3.5.xlsx>

¹⁰ <https://bscdocs.elaxon.co.uk/data-integration-platform/dsd001-dip-governance>

¹¹ <https://bscdocs.elaxon.co.uk/data-integration-platform/dsd001-annex-1-dip-rules-implementation-dates-and-transition-arrangements>

¹² <https://bscdocs.elaxon.co.uk/data-integration-platform/dsd002-dip-connection-and-operation>

Summary of redlining updates

| DIP Document | Updates |
|---|--|
| DSD002 Annex 1 'DIP On-Boarding Non-Functional Checks' ¹³ (Attachment E) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 – updates to align self-assessment with the MHHS Qualification Assessment Document¹⁴ (QAD); • 1.2 – added to detail DIP User requirements assessed via self-testing in alignment with the DIP Assessment Criteria¹⁵; • 1.3 – added to detail DIP User requirements assessed via DIP Manager testing in alignment with the DIP Assessment Criteria. |
| DSD002 Annex 2 'Detailed DIP Operational Requirements' ¹⁶ (Attachment F) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.1 – text added to clarify that senders must have the capability to control the number of messages sent within each API call (E2E0101); • 9.7 – clarification that duplicate messages should be identifiable using the Sender Unique Reference and/or Transaction ID (E2E0204 and E2E0205); • 9.14 and 9.15 – updates to reflect the Interface Code of Connection¹⁷; • 11.3 – addition of DIP User synchronous response requirements (E2E1003). |
| DSD007 'DIP Glossary' ¹⁸ (Attachment G) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addition of definition for MHHS Qualification. |

¹³ <https://bscdocs.elexon.co.uk/data-integration-platform/dsd002-annex-1-dip-on-boarding-non-functional-checks>

¹⁴ https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/uploads/4c588665-463b-491f-ad97-4497db486c57/MHHS-DEL2296_Qualification_Assessment_Document_v5.0.pdf

¹⁵ <https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/api/documentlibrary/Qualification/DIP%20Assessment%20Criteria%20for%20MHHS%20Qualification.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://bscdocs.elexon.co.uk/data-integration-platform/dsd002-annex-2-detailed-dip-operational-requirements>

¹⁷ <https://www.mhhsprogramme.co.uk/dip/interface-code-of-connection-and-pki-certificate-policy>

¹⁸ <https://bscdocs.elexon.co.uk/data-integration-platform/dsd007-dip-glossary>

4. Impacts and Costs

DIP User impacts

The DIP CR will not impact DIP Users as it simply seeks to align the DIP Rules with the MHHS design, which prospective DIP Users have built to. There are no new obligations created and therefore no impact to DIP User systems.

There will be a positive impact on that this DIP CR will provide additional clarity for those going through DIP On-Boarding and should mitigate the risk of prospective DIP Users being unprepared for or confused by DIP On-Boarding.

DIP impacts

| Impact on DIP Rules | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| DIP Document | Impact |
| DSD001 | Amended as per Attachment B |
| DSD001 Annex 1 | Amended as per Attachment C |
| DSD002 | Amended as per Attachment D |
| DSD002 Annex 1 | Amended as per Attachment E |
| DSD002 Annex 2 | Amended as per Attachment F |
| DSD007 | Amended as per Attachment G |

DIP Manager Impacts

There are no anticipated impacts to the DIP Manager other than the effort required to implement the document updates.

Industry Code impacts

There are no anticipated impacts to other Industry Codes or any changes to Industry Codes that are in progress.

DIP CR Cost estimation

As DCR0003 intends to align the DIP Rules with the MHHS Programme design there are no expected costs to industry.

The only cost will be for the DIP Manager, associated with the DIP document updates.

| Cost Estimates | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------|---|
| Organisation | Implementation (£) | On-going (£) | Impacts |
| DIP Manager | <3k | N/A | Updating six DIP Subsidiary Documents and Annexes |
| Industry | N/A | N/A | No new requirements for DIP Users |
| Total | <3k | 0 | - |

Applicable DIP Objectives

The DIP Manager believes that this DIP CR will have the following impacts on the Applicable DIP Objectives:

| Impacts to Applicable DIP Objectives | | |
|--|-----------------|--|
| Applicable DIP Objective | Impact | Rationale |
| (a) Provide accurate and timely support for the sharing of applicable market data. | Positive | The DIP Manager must ensure that all DIP Users are ready to use the DIP before they are promoted to the Production Environment. DCR0003 will ensure the DIP Mangers has the full vires to do this and will give prospective DIP Users clarity on how this will be checked. |
| (b) Further consumer interests through the appropriately governed sharing of data. | Neutral | - |
| (c) Facilitate competitive change and innovation through the efficient and economic delivery of reliable and adaptable services. | Neutral | - |

5. DIP CR Progression



DIP CR Materiality Criteria?

The criteria for a DIP CR to be considered as material, and therefore a Tier One DIP CR, includes:

- an implementation cost greater than £500,000 for the DIP Manager and/or £250,000 for DIP Users
- placing new obligations on DIP Users and/or the DIP Manager that will require a change to the DIP User's business operating model
- an Implementation Date more than 24 months after the date on which the decision is made.

Change Tier

The DIP Manager believes that DCR0003 does not meet the materiality criteria and should therefore be considered a Tier Two DIP CR.

Progression Timeline

This DIP CR must be implemented prior to M10, but there is benefit to the DIP Rules being correct and aligned to the MHHS Design Artefacts as soon as possible.

| Progression Timetable | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Event | Date |
| Initial Assessment published | 11 June 2025 |
| Industry Consultation (15 WD) | 12 June 2025 – 3 July 2025 |
| Final Assessment published | 7 July 2025 |
| Decision published | 4 August 2025 |
| Proposed Implementation Date | 4 August 2025 |

Implementation

The DIP Manager believes that this DIP CR should be implemented as soon as possible, so that the benefits can be realised.

As such, the DIP Manger recommends an Implementation Date for DCR0003 of one the day of the decision.

6. Industry Views

This section summarizes the response received to the DIP CR Consultation. The full responses can be found in Attachment A.

Seven responses were received, and there was mixed support for the DIP CR; the majority of responses support the DIP CR.

Responses were received from two DIP Connection Providers, one Code Body, two Distributors, and two Metering Services organisations.

Summary of CR0003 DIP CR Consultation Responses

| Question | Yes | No | Neutral/No Comment | Other |
|---|-----|----|--------------------|-------|
| Do you agree with the DCR003 proposed solution? | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Do you agree that the draft redlining delivers the intent of DCR0003? | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Will DCR0003 impact your organisation? | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Will your organisation incur any costs in implementing DCR0003? | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| Do you agree with the proposed implementation approach for DCR0003? | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| Do you have any further comments on DCR0003? | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

The majority of respondents agreed that DCR0003 should be implemented. The reasons provided were that the changes were to documents, which needed to be made to reflect the MHHS design. In turn, it was likely that there would be minimal systems impact (if any).

However, other respondent held concerns. These were (in summary):

- The DCR0003 rationale was not clear;
- The DCR0003 scope was too broad;
- MHHS NFRs had not been fully set out in the proposed red-lining;
- The E2E Solution Architecture is not fully captured in the proposed red-lining;
- Costs would not be restricted to making document-only changes; rather, there would be system costs associated with implementing additional validation checks; and
- The annual self-assessment criteria are onerous and lack clarity on what is expected from DIP Users.

The DIP Manager is in the process of clarifying the annual self-assessment criteria. However, the DIP Manager will seek views from DCAB on how to do this. One respondent to the consultation suggested that a separate DIP CR should be raised to clarify this.

Further, some respondents noted issues accessing the documents. The DIP Manager will ensure issues like this do not occur in the future.

Comments on the proposed redlining

Three respondents did not agree that the draft redlining delivered the intent of DCR0003, and their specific comments are addressed below.

| Comments on the DCR0003 Proposed Redlining | | |
|--|--|---|
| Document & Location | Comment | Elexon's Response |
| DSD001 | | |
| Page 1 | <p>It is not clear why 01 October 2024 has been removed, as this was the original date that the DSD came into operation.</p> <p>Is the intention to remove the reference to a date altogether? If so, please also delete the word 'from'.</p> <p>If this intention is to include the date of the latest version of the DSD, then worth adding this to the explanation in the CP to avoid confusion.</p> | <p>This is standard practice for Elexon when publishing redlined documents – the effective from date is deleted to indicate that the redlined document is not effective and, if approved and published, the new effective from date will be added. A date will be re-added to the DSD to ensure it is clear when it is effective from.</p> |
| DSD001 Annex 1 | | |
| 3.3.3 | <p>The initial reference to 'Qualification' should be amended to 'MHHS Qualification' to align to other references in this section.</p> <p>The existing drafting states that DIP On-Boarding checks do not have to be completed until the DIP User is ready to start migration. We think that this is misleading. There are other activities that a party must complete after DIP On-Boarding before it starts migration, for example MHHS Qualification and Service Activation.</p> <p>We do not agree with the addition of the last sentence to this paragraph. Our understanding is that promotion of DIP Users to Production was being considered for some parties to de-risk M10. We do not agree that this should be permitted after M10 as this presents a risk to live operation. If DIP Manager considers that this is needed, please provide the rationale and an assessment of risks.</p> | <p>The DIP Manager views it as a risk user who is in the process of completing the MHHS Qualification, from being prompted for production, as they are completing their qualification. However, they will be restricted from using the DIP until they are qualified. This occurs during the MHHS qualification and is limited to a defined timeframe.</p> <p>Additionally, Users should not be treated differently in this regard; therefore, this policy will apply to all. This approach will help ensure that there is no delay between accessing the DIP and completing the MHHS Qualification.</p> |
| DSD0002 | | |

| | | |
|--------|--|---|
| Page 1 | <p>It is not clear why 01 October 2024 has been removed as this was the original date that the DSD came into operation.</p> <p>Is the intention to remove the reference to a date altogether? If so, please also delete the word 'from'.</p> <p>If this intention is to include the date of the latest version of the DSD, then worth adding this to the explanation in the CP to avoid confusion.</p> | <p>This is standard practice for Elexon when publishing redlined documents – the effective from date is deleted to indicate that the redlined document is not effective and, if approved and published, the new effective from date will be added. A date will be re-added to the DSD to ensure it is clear when it is effective from</p> |
| 2.1.1 | <p>List refers to 'Meter Data Recorders' - this should be 'Meter Data Retrieval Service' as per the Glossary.</p> | <p>Terminology has been amended to ensure it is consistent with the Glossary.</p> |
| 2.5.1 | <p>It is not clear why DIP Manager has included obligations in the DIP Rules on parties to comply with directions provided by the REC Code Manager. This is not something that RECCo has requested.</p> <p>It is not clear why DIP Manager has introduced an obligation on DIP Users to comply with directions that it issues that may not be consistent with the DIP Rules.</p> <p>These appear to be very broad obligations. Without clearly articulating the rationale for these changes, we do not support them.</p> | <p>The DIP Manager sees this addition as a way to assist potential DIP Users in achieving their MHHS Qualification. This initiative is specifically focused on MHHS Qualification and adheres to what is feasible within the DIP Rules. As a result, it is limited to a defined timeframe to help potential DIP Users integrate into the DIP.</p> |
| 2.12.4 | <p>This check should only apply to those Party Roles that send interfaces into the DIP. Suggest adding 'For DIP Roles not required to send any interfaces into the DIP, this check will not apply'.</p> | <p>The suggest sentence has been inserted into DSD002.</p> |
| 2.12.5 | <p>This check should only apply to those Party Roles that receive interfaces from the DIP. Suggest adding 'For DIP Roles not required to receive any interfaces from the DIP, this check will not apply'.</p> | <p>The suggest sentence has been inserted into DSD002.</p> |
| 2.13.5 | <p>Amend 'DIP manager' to 'DIP Manager'.</p> | <p>The amendment has been made in DSD002.</p> |
| 2.13.6 | <p>This states DCPs will carry out checks. The DCPs are being checked, not carrying out the checks. Amend to say 'DCPs may undergo assessment on behalf of DIP Applicants'</p> | <p>The amendment has been made in DSD002.</p> |

| | | |
|--------|---|---|
| 2.14.1 | <p>Replace 'On-Boarding' with 'DIP On-Boarding' so that it matches the glossary in DSD007.</p> <p>Also worth checking occasional use of 'DIP On-boarding' and ensuring consistency in capitalisation.</p> | The amendment has been in DSD002. |
| 2.15.2 | <p>We are concerned that the change to promote parties to Production before they are MHHS Qualified has not been fully risk assessed. No rationale has been provided for this change. Our understanding is that this is only being considered for some parties ahead of M10. Any change to the DIP Rules should be restricted to this specific case, or an explanation provided as to why it is needed after M10, and how any risks would be mitigated.</p> | <p>The DIP Manager views it as a risk to restrict a user who is in the process of completing MHHS Qualification from being prompted for production before their qualification is finished. Users should not be treated differently in this regard; therefore, this policy will apply to all. This approach will help ensure that there is no delay between accessing the DIP and completing the MHHS Qualification.</p> |

DSD002 Annex 1

| | | |
|---------|---|--|
| General | <p>The term used in this Annex 1 is 'DIP Onboarding Checks'. In DSD002 it is referred to as 'Onboarding Checks'. Amend for consistency.</p> <p>Note that the updated term should also be added to DSD007 Glossary, which still refers to 'Non-Functional On-Boarding Checks'.</p> | The amendment has been in DSD002, Annex 1. |
| 1.1.1 | <p>As a general comment, as there is no explanation provided here on why changes have been made to the yearly self-assessment criteria – both removal and addition of requirements.</p> <p>The changes made to this section broadly reflect the requirements set out in the QAD for new user DIP On-Boarding. However, it does not necessarily follow that changes that have been applied for MHHS on-boarding are appropriate for yearly self-assessment. For example, requiring a DIP User to resubmit all information each year may not be proportionate to the risks that DIP Manager wishes to mitigate (both for the DIP User and DIP Manager).</p> | <p>To ensure that the DIP Manager can be confident in the functionality of the DIP Users with the DIP, it is essential to validate their capabilities on an annual basis. Each year, a DIP User must evaluate themselves against the self-assessment criteria to determine their ability to use the DIP effectively. If DIP Users do not perform this assessment, it poses a risk to the DIP. Therefore, the requirement for annual self-assessment is proportionate to the responsibilities assumed when using the DIP.</p> |

| | | |
|---------|--|--|
| | <p>We note that DIP Manager is developing its Risk Register and performance assurance approach. The enduring self-assessment requirements should be considered alongside this work.</p> <p>Please note that these changes impact RECCo's yearly self-assessment requirements in its DIP User role of EES Provider.</p> <p>Without an impact assessment in the consultation document and a clear rationale for the changes, we are not able to assess and endorse this change. Given the application to enduring Self-Assessment (which is not an MHHS Programme alignment requirement), we question if DCR0003 should be a Tier 1 change rather than Tier 2.</p> | |
| 1.1.1.a | Second reference to ISO should be '27001' not '2701' | The amendment has been in DSD002, Annex 1. |
| 1.1.1.a | Drafting at the end of the para needs to be amended. Add comma after 'management' and update to lower case a in 'and'. | The amendment has been in DSD002, Annex 1. |
| 1.1.1 | The CoCo states that the level of evidence requested will vary depending on the type of DIP Service User. For example, it is expected that Market Participants and DIP Connection Providers (collectively referred to as DIP Service Users in this document), will already follow best practice standards and frameworks for information security. This is not reflected in the DSD which makes the DSD appear more onerous than the CoCo intended. | The purpose of Annex 1 is to reflect the CoCo. The DIP Manager does not view this as burdensome; instead, it serves as a reflection of what DIP Users would typically complete during their DIP onboarding checks. |
| 1.1.1.n | Suggest that completion of an access agreement should be a standalone para as it's a requirement rather than a part of the self-assessment. | The amendment has been in DSD002, Annex 1. |
| 1.2.1 | 72 hr buffering is included in the table twice | The duplication of text will be removed. |
| 1.2.1 | 'DIP users' in the first line should be capitalised | Defined term has been capitalised. |
| 1.2.1 | The bottom 2 requirements (9.8) should be clearer on the scope e.g. there are exclusions in the design doc covering IF021 etc from the | This has been amended to reflect the MHHS design. |

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| | MHHS Design that are not captured, and the requirement is therefore not correctly set out. | |
| 1.3.1 | <p>9.1.1 - requirement to send messages in accordance with Swagger could be inconsistent with the REC. REC has a requirement to comply with the EMDS which takes precedence over Swagger. The format of messages is a Code (BSC, REC, DCUSA) requirement, not a DIP Rules requirement and therefore should be removed.</p> <p>As an alternative, DIP Manager could add a clear statement to the DIP Rules that Swagger is required to align with the EMDS and if there is a discrepancy, the EMDS has precedence.</p> <p>As drafted, the reference in 9.1.1 contradicts DSD002 Annex 2 para 3.4.1: <i>“The technical interface specification is defined by the Energy Market Data Specification (EMDS). It defines the interface at a logical level to enable DIP Users and DCPs to ensure their systems meet its requirements. It contains instructions on how Messages are to be composed, the structure of the Messages and any specific data validation to be performed.”</i></p> | This has been amended to reflect the suggested text. |
| | <p>As a SIT participant, does this statement provide an extra onus on us to provide evidence again to the DIP manager? It also could mean as SIT participant the proposal will come into effect before we have completed qualification. This would also essentially mean a new requirement on providing testing evidence contrary to the ‘Impacts and Costs’ section of the DCR0003 DIP CR Consultation Proposal document.</p> <p>The point is raised in multiple sections (1.3.2, etc etc) throughout the document and this comment would apply to all of them.</p> | <p>To ensure that the DIP Manager can be confident in the functionality of the DIP Users with the DIP, it is essential to validate their capabilities on an annual basis. Each year, a DIP User must evaluate themselves against the self-assessment criteria to determine their ability to use the DIP effectively. If DIP Users do not perform this assessment, it poses a risk to the DIP. Therefore, the requirement for annual self-assessment is proportionate to the responsibilities assumed when using the DIP.</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| 1.2 Self Testing | Performance requirements in sections 11.3.3 and 11.4.2 should be defined in terms of input load per unit of time. System performance can vary significantly depending on whether the hourly load is received all at once at the beginning of the hour or is evenly distributed throughout the hour. | |
| DSD002 Annex 2 | | |
| 9.1.2 | <p>This Annex does not appear to have been updated to reflect the latest version of the E2E Solution Architectural doc: Each HTTP transaction is limited to 1MB in size by the DIP firewall. This value is set to protect the DIP & message senders from potential malicious activity. The limit has been set based on the size of the reports generated by ECS (the largest potential single message). The 1MB limit is subject to review based on further non-functional testing and changes.</p> <p>Suggest reviewing against any interim releases after the DIP doc was developed to identify changes. The comments below are provided against an assessment of IR8.2 and not any subsequent releases.</p> | This has been amended to reflect the updated E2E Solution Architectural. |
| 9.1.4 | As above, this doesn't appear to have been updated to reflect the latest version of the E2E Solution Architectural doc with references to the 1MB limit. | No amendment has been made as this requirement does not appear to be in the E2E Solution Architectural document. The DIP Manager will continue looking into this area to determine if any future changes are needed. |
| 9.10.1.a | Cross reference copied from the E2E Solution Architecture doc doesn't work here and should be updated. | This has been amended to reflect the updated E2E Solution Architectural. |
| 9.10.1.b | This does not appear to have been updated to reflect the latest version of the E2E Solution Architectural doc. | <p>The DIP Manager need further details to address the problem and is undertaking further review.</p> <p>To do this the DIP Manager is gather additional information the respondent.</p> |
| 9.6.5 | This doesn't appear to have been updated to reflect the latest version of the E2E Solution Architectural doc. | The DIP Manager need further details to address the problem and is undertaking further review. |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | To do this the DIP Manager is gather additional information the respondent. |
| 9.6.11 | This doesn't appear to have been updated to reflect the latest version of the E2E Solution Architectural doc. | The DIP Manager need further details to address the problem and is undertaking further review. To do this the DIP Manager is gather additional information the respondent. |
| 9.8.4 | The requirements of MHHS Design E2E1004 have not been correctly reflected. It is missing the exclusions on the requirements for the IF035, IF036, IF037. The application of profile coefficients has also been missed from E2E1004 in para 9.8 | This has been amended to reflect the updated E2E Solution Architectural. |
| 9.8.5 | The requirements traceability matrix suggests that E2E1006 has been included in DSD002 Annex 2 para 9.8.5. However, we cannot find this para and we cannot find the obligation elsewhere in the DSD002 Annex 2. | The requirement in 9.8.5 has been be red-added into the red-lined text. |
| 9.1.5 | Appears to be missing the limitation to 50,000 as required in E2E0101. | The limitation has been added to the requirements. |
| 11.3.3 | Drafting update - remove one of the instances of 'excludes' from the first line. | This has been amended to remove one of the instances of excludes. |
| 11.3, 11.4 | Performance requirements in sections 11.3.3 and 11.4.2 should be defined in terms of input load per unit of time. System performance can vary significantly depending on whether the hourly load is received all at once at the beginning of the hour or is evenly distributed throughout the hour. | The DIP rules states what described in the requirements and consider average scenarios and peak volumes |
| 11.3 Message Latency 11.4 System Availability | Performance requirements in sections 11.3.3 and 11.4.2 should be defined in terms of input load per unit of time. System performance can vary significantly depending on whether the hourly load is received all at once at the beginning of the hour or is evenly distributed throughout the hour. | The DIP rules states what described in the requirements and consider average scenarios and peak volumes |

| | | |
|---------|--|--|
| General | Useful to add definitions for DIP Open API Definition and Swagger | A DIP Open API Definition has been added to DSD007. |
| General | The definition of 'Non-Functional On-Boarding Checks' has been amended in DSD002 to 'On-Boarding Checks. Update the definition in the glossary to match this change. | DSD007 has been be amended to reflect the updated definition of 'Non-Functional On-Boarding Checks'. |

7. Recommendations

The DIP Manager decision panel is invited to:

- **AGREE** that DCR0003 :
 - DOES better facilitate DIP Applicable Objective (a);
- **APPROVE** DCR0003;
- **APPROVE** an Implementation Date of **5 August 2025**;
- **APPROVE** the proposed DSD amendments; and
- **APPROVE** the DCR0003 Final Assessment Report.